

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
GREENEVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
v.) No. 2:09-CR-045
)
ADRIAN DORSEY)

ORDER

This criminal case is before the court on the August 24, 2010 report and recommendation (“R&R”) of Chief United States Magistrate Judge Dennis H. Inman [doc. 469]. Magistrate Judge Inman recommends that the defendant’s motions to suppress [docs. 419, 420] be denied as premature. There have been no objections filed within the time allowed by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and no transcript of the hearing on the motion has been filed.

De novo review by the district court of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation is both statutorily and constitutionally required. *See United States v. Shami*, 754 F.2d 670, 672 (6th Cir. 1985). However, it is necessary only to review “those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Even though no objections have been filed, the undersigned has nonetheless reviewed the R&R, the defendant’s motions, and the parties’ briefing. Finding itself in agreement with the magistrate judge, the court **ADOPTS** the findings of fact and conclusions of law set out in Magistrate Judge Inman’s report and recommendation [doc. 469]. It is **ORDERED** that the defendant’s motions to suppress [docs. 419, 420] are **DENIED** as

premature.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/ Leon Jordan
United States District Judge